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There was a time when Great Britain was led by Sir Winston Churchill, and that was the Age of Resistance and of Glory. Today all we have is Gordon Brown and the time of capitulation has arrived.

One could have hoped that after the tragedy of 7 July 2005, Londonistan – this symbol of the age whereby the British capital serves as the place of refuge of all the Islamists of the world - belonged to the past. Don’t kid yourself! Less than four years after the London massacre, those who plotted against democracy in Europe and against societal progress in the Muslim-Arab world are getting a warmer welcome from Westminster than ever before.

Let’s consider one fact, to begin with: in mid-February the Dutch populist deputy Geerts Wilders, who made a film critical of Islam – Fitna – was purely and simply expelled from Great Britain. He had been invited by a member of the House of Lords to speak before a group of parliamentarians during a private meeting at which his film was supposed to be screened. Another member of the honourable assembly, Lord Ahmed, who is of Pakistani origin, threatened to mobilize thousands of Muslims to prevent Geert Wilders from getting inside the Parliament building. The Labour Government, more precisely Madame Jacqui Smith, Interior Minister, then ordered the arrest of Mr. Wilders, who was taken, manu militari, to his plane and expelled from the country. One may like Mr. Wilders or not, but we are talking about the elected representative of a member country of the European Union. If some people, rightly or wrongly, believe themselves to be insulted by the views he holds of Islam, they have the possibility of taking the matter to the courts. But in London, they will not have to go so far: the Interior Minister has spared them the effort by censuring the troublemaker.

On the other hand, there is no censure for Anjem Choudary. He is a charming man, a true moderate: he has ‘forbidden’ British Muslims to cooperate with the police in the struggle against terrorism and, in 2006, he called for the assassination of the Pope. Two groups which he created or directs – al-Muhajiroun and al-Ghurabaa – have been found to be ‘terrorist organizations’ and banned. But on 28 February he was allowed to organize a demonstration in London in favour of the Sharia and against ‘the oppression of human law.’ For him, his British compatriots are ‘unbelievers’ who, among their other vices, indulge in gambling, are alcoholics and worship false gods. A moderate, you say...
Neither is there censure for Rachid Ghannouchi, a Tunisian extremist who, in the 1980s, was the founder of the Islamic Tendency Movement, then of Ennahda, two movements which aimed to transform Tunisia into an ‘imamat,’ in the framework of a grand Islamic caliphate.

These past few weeks, he spoke out against Israel in the British media – which is his fundamental right. What is undoubtedly more debatable is that he acted as the advocate of Hamas, which is considered as a terrorist movement in Europe – and he believes Hamas is the spearhead of the Palestinian resistance. Better still, on 19 February he co-signed with several other Islamist leaders close to the Muslim Brotherhood a call for the creation of a ‘third Jihadist front.’ The document was adopted at the conclusion of a ‘summit’ held in Istanbul during the course of which the same leaders called upon the Arab states to facilitate ‘the passage of combatants’ and arms’ before hurling out the cry: ‘There will be no accord with Israel.’

On 22 February, in an interview with the satellite television network Al-Hiwar (during a broadcast of ‘Taamoulat fiddine wal siyassa’ - reflections on religion and politics), he said he admired the Qassam rockets, a ‘civilised weapon’: “The word “terrorize” has, here, a magnificent meaning... That’s why I admire the Qassam rockets. The aim of those missiles being only to terrorize...”

More recently, on 23 March, he cast doubt even on the right of the Jewish state to exist: ‘Israel is a temporary political reality. In the 1920s or 1960s, there was a state called Zanzibar. Where is it today, this state called Zanzibar?’ Can one be clearer? We note that in the same interview the ‘moderate’ Ghannouchi gave us quite directly his political plans for Tunisia: ‘A democratic state in a Muslim society like Tunisia can only be an Islamic state.’ Here again: can one be any clearer?

When you criticise the great degree of tolerance which they have shown for years when confronted with Islamism, the English authorities are used to responding that this is nothing more than respecting freedom of speech. That is a nice excuse for covering up a quite cynical calculation. Because the reality is quite different: London believes in fact that in order to protect itself against the Muslim-Arab world toppling into the hands of the Jihadist ‘extremists’ they have no choice but to take sides and encourage the accession to power of the ‘moderates.’ They forget a few small details: in Pakistan it is the ‘moderate’ Islamists who have encouraged the Afghan Taliban; in Algeria it is the ‘moderate’ Islamists of the Islamic Salvation Front who gave rise to the killers of the GIA in the 1990s. And here and there around the world, it is the ‘moderates’ of the Muslim Brotherhood who are currently preparing the establishment of the Caliphates which we will perhaps be confronting tomorrow.

Her Majesty’s Government might as well tolerate the activities of a Choudary – advocate of the Sharia. It might as well offer its protection to a Ghannouchi – propagandist of the Jihad. It is doing nothing other than preparing new ‘July 7’ disasters and new defeats for democracy.

‘You were given the choice between war and dishonour. You have chosen dishonour and you will get war,’ Winston Churchill told Neville Chamberlain the day after the Munich agreements.

But Great Britain is run by Mr. Gordon Brown in 2009, not by Mr. Churchill.
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